

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/817,229	Applicant(s) FERGUSON ET AL.	
	Examiner Olga N. Chernyshev	Art Unit 1646	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Olga N. Chernyshev.

(3) Steve Ludwig.

(2) John Ulm.

(4) Brian Skelton.

Date of Interview: 05 January 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-7 and 18-20.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

JOHN ULM
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The proposed amendment of the claims did not appear to overcome 112, first paragraph, enablement rejection. Applicant was advised to present publications, which support the assertion that the in vitro model described in the instant specification is predictive of ischemia. Applicant was also advised to present data which shows that determination of the amount and regime of administration of an angiotensin receptor antagonist is routine and does not require undue experimentation .